

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-22, and 40-51 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 16, and 40 being the independent claims. Claims 7-9, 13-15, and 23-39 were previously cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 16, and 40 are sought to be amended for clarity. Support for the amendments is found in the instant specification, at least at, for example, paragraphs [0017], [0028] - [0031], [0043] and [0048] and FIGs. 3 and 7A. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute similar or broader claims, with respect to the cancelled and amended claims, in the future. These amendments should be entered after final because they merely clarify implicit features, do not require further search or consideration by the Examiner, and they place the claims in better condition for allowance and/or reduce the issues for appeal.

These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication, in paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, that the objection to claims 2, 19, and 41-43 has been withdrawn. The Examiner is also thanked for the indication, in paragraph 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, that the rejection of claim 40-43 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been withdrawn.

Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview

Applicant submits the following Statement of Substance of Interviews conducted between the Examiner and Applicant's representative, Randall K. Baldwin, on December 7, 2010. Applicant's representative gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by the Examiner in granting a telephone interview on December 7, 2010. In the interview, the Examiner clarified the rejection of claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-22, and 40-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In particular, the Examiner clarified his comments regarding independent claim 1 and the rejection of claim 1 and independent claims 16 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant's representative and the Examiner additionally discussed portions of the specification supporting the features recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. Applicant's representative also discussed proposed claim amendments and portions of the specification supporting the amendments and the Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments in conjunction with remarks pointing out support for the amendments in the specification would overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and place the application in condition for allowance.

The substance of the discussion and arguments in the telephone interview is included in the present remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-22 and 40-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons stated below.

With regards to claims 1, 16, and 40, the Examiner alleges, which Applicant does not concede, that the limitation "receiving a copy command associated with the copy selection, the copy command including a password associated with a user" and that "[n]owhere in the specification is it described that a user password is included with a copy command." (Office Action, pages 2-3). As acknowledged by the Examiner, the specification "discusses the use of passwords as *a priori* knowledge" (Office Action, page 3). Further, the instant specification discusses non-limiting, exemplary embodiments wherein "[t]he secure nature of files or documents is such that the data cannot be accessed without *a priori* knowledge" and "[o]ne example of the *a priori* knowledge is a password." (Applicant's specification, paragraph [0017]).

However, as discussed during the aforementioned telephonic interview, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1, 16, and 40 to accommodate the rejection of the Examiner.

For example, claims 1 and 16 as amended herein recite, using respective language, *inter alia*, "receiving a copy command associated with the copy selection, the copy command including a flag or indicator associated with a user."

Further, for example, claim 40 as amended herein recites, among other features, "instructions to receive a copy command associated with the copy selection, the copy command including a flag or indicator associated with a user."

Support for the above-noted features is found at least at, for example, paragraphs [0017], [0029] - [0031], [0043] and [0048] of the specification. By way of example and not limitation, the instant specification describes that "[a]ccording to one implementation, the decision 758 *can utilize a flag or other indicator that may have*

been stored by the clipboard processing 700 in determining whether the source is secure." (Applicant's specification, paragraph [0048] (emphasis added)). As discussed during the aforementioned interview, the specification further discloses that in a non-limiting embodiment "[t]he destination can be deemed secure if security is imposed, such as by a password or other authentication technique." *Id.* By way of example and not limitation, the specification describes an exemplary embodiment of "clipboard copy processing" wherein "a flag or other indicator can also be stored in the clipboard buffer or elsewhere to indicate whether the selected content stored in the clipboard buffer is a secured item." (Applicant's specification, paragraph [0043]). Therefore, the specification describes exemplary embodiments wherein a flag or other indicator, such as a password can be used to determine if a source and destination is secure as part of clipboard copy processing.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the above-noted features of amended claims 1, 16, and 40 directed to "a copy command associated with the copy selection, the copy command including a flag or indicator associated with a user" are described in the specification.

Based on the above remarks and in view of the present amendments to claims 1, 16, and 40, Applicant submits that claims 1, 16, and 40 are now in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Additionally, at least based on their respective dependencies to claims 1, 16, and 40, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-6, 10-12, 15-22, and 41-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Reply to Office Action of November 3, 2010

Patrick ZUHLI
Appl. No. 10/028,397

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-22 and 40-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and pass these claims to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Randall K. Baldwin
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,713

Date: 16 December 2010

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
1282580_1.DOC